



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,162	10/06/2003	Chih-Hsiang Yang		5730
7590	11/02/2005		EXAMINER	
Chih-Hsiang YANG			MAI, TRI M	
P. O. Box No. 6-57				
Junghe, TAIPEI 235			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TAIWAN			3727	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/678,162	YANG, CHIH-HSIANG
	Examiner Tri M. Mai	Art Unit 3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term steel cable is incorrect. "cable" refers to elongate objects that does not have any rigidity along its longitudinal direction.

In claim 1, the recitation "provide the steel cable with elasticity" is confusing. It is unclear how the fixing plate 231 would give any elasticity to the two posts 23.

"using characteristics...as being non-slippery" is confusing.

"each being accommodated around an upholding post" is confusing.

"a bag of the golf club bag" is confusing.

"portion. ;", the period is not permitted.

"are stretch to stand" is confusing.

"enabled to steadily stand" is confusing.

In claim 1, the claim recites "at least a socket pivotally disposed". The claim later recites "each being accommodated around an upholding pos" is confusing. "Each" implies that there are a plurality of sockets. The claim previously recites only "a socket". Furthermore, "an upholding post" seems to be a double inclusion of "supporting posts" previously recited.

2. Claims 1, and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng (6386362) in view of Chang (6682027). Cheng teaches a bag having a supporting posts, steel cable, and a plurality of support posts, each disposed inside a socket. Cheng meets all claimed limitations except for the socket being pivotally connected to the bottom. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide pivotally sockets as taught by Chang to enable the bag to easily adjustable.

3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (6682027) in view of Cheng (6386362)) Cheng teaches a bag having a supporting posts, steel cable, and a support post pivotally disposed inside a socket. Chang meets all claimed limitations except for the two pivotal posts. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to duplicate parts for a multiplied effect (St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc.)193 USPQ 8, 11 (7th Cir. 1977). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an additional pivotal post to provide added support.

With respect to the cable, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the cable actuating means 64 and 24 as taught by Cheng to provide an alternate actuating means for deploying the two supports.

4. Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri M. Mai whose telephone number is (571)272-4541. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on (571)272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tri M. Mai  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3727

